

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 13, 2004. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 8, and 11 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 11 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of Claim 1.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that Claims 2-11 have been carefully reviewed and amended to clarify their language, and to make clearer that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, first paragraph. Specifically, independent Claims 2, 8, and 11 have been amended to recite that the second decoding method needs to perform rendering of the decoded raster image data in parallel with transferring the raster image data, which has been rendered in the other band of the second area by the second decoding method, to the printer engine. Support in the application for this feature can be found in the specification at least from page 16, line 7, to page 17, line 14, with reference to Figure 16 (it is to be understood of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the preferred embodiment that is referred to).

Applicant notes that the first decoding method is capable of transferring decoded raster image data to a printer engine in real time. However, in the second decoding method, in transferring image data to a printer engine, two bands (1403) are needed as a double buffer (which are not needed in the first decoding method). Therefore,

it is significant that in a case where the second decoding method is discriminated, the band height is set to be lower than the height in the first decoding method. Applicant submits that the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from Claim 2 or Claim 8, and, therefore, are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that the Office Action does not include any prior art rejections based on Sections 102 or 103, and thus Applicant believes that upon the withdrawal of the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection mentioned above this application will be allowed.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and the allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 456013v1